



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,185	03/06/2002	Raymond J. Beffa	3037.10US (95-1074.10)	1655
24247	7590	08/09/2006	EXAMINER	
TRASK BRITT P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110			RODRIGUEZ, JOSEPH C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3653	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/092,185	BEFFA, RAYMOND J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joseph C. Rodriguez	3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 March 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/28/05; 11/2/05; 4/14/06
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Information Disclosure Statement***

With regards to the multiple Information Disclosure Statements submitted by Applicant, the cited documents will be considered by the examiner in the same manner as references encountered during a normal search of prior art. There is no duty to consider these references to a greater extent than those ordinarily looked at during a regular search by the examiner.

Applicants' attention is directed to MPEP 2004, which provides assistance to applicants in complying with the duty of disclosure. In particular, item 13 states

It is desirable to avoid the submission of long lists of documents if it can be avoided. Eliminate clearly irrelevant and marginally pertinent cumulative information. If a long list is submitted, highlight those documents which have been specifically brought to applicant's attention and/or are known to be of most significance. See *Penn Yan Boats, Inc. v. Sea Lark Boats, Inc.*, 359 F. Supp. 948, 175 USPQ 260 (S.D. Fla. 1972), aff 'd, 479 F.2d 1338, 178 USPQ 577 (5th Cir. 1973), cert. denied, 414 U.S. 874 (1974). But cf. *Molins PLC v. Textron Inc.*, 48 F.3d 1172, 33 USPQ2d 1823 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

While compliance with these guidelines is not mandatory, and there is no requirement to explain the materiality of cited references, the cloaking of a clearly relevant reference by inclusion in a long list of citations may not comply with an applicant's duty of disclosure, see *Penn Yan Boats, Inc. v. Sea Lark Boats, Inc.*, *supra*.

Here, it is further noted that Examiner is aware that Applicant often submits long lists of documents to conform with Applicant's duty of disclosure. Examiner merely requests, as stated above, that Applicant highlight the documents that are of most significance and/or note the relevance of the various submitted documents (e.g., cited in related application, cited in international search report).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Here, the language “storing an enhanced reliability testing flag stored in the integrated circuit device associated with unique identification code” (claim 1, ln. 3) is nonsensical and thus indefinite. Examiner requests clarification on the interpretation of the “stored” language. In the interim, in the interests of compact prosecution, Examiner has interpreted this limitation as if the “stored” language was deleted.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yabe (US 5,726,074) in view of Di Zenzo et al. (“Di Zenzo”)(US 6,130,442).

Yabe (Fig. 5a-7b) teaches a testing method for an integrated circuit comprising

storing an enhanced reliability testing flag (Fig. 7a, "Electrical Characteristics Data 3") associated with a "unique identification code" (Fig. 7a where combination of wafer ID with positional coordinates create a unique code for each chip) of each integrated circuit device of the plurality of integrated circuit devices for indicating whether each integrated circuit device requires enhanced reliability testing (col. 7, ln. 13-col. 8, ln. 10; col. 9, ln. 20-col. 10, ln. 14 teaches storing test results of specific chip that determines future quality testing of chip);

automatically reading the unique identification code of each integrated circuit device of the plurality of integrated circuit devices wherein each integrated circuit device of the plurality of integrated circuit devices forms a portion of a wafer (Fig. 6a, ID unit 3b; col. 8, ln. 1-11; col. 9, ln. 60-col. 10, ln. 4),

accessing the enhanced reliability testing flag stored for the unique identification code of each integrated circuit device of the plurality of integrated circuit devices (Id. wherein reading of "data 3" can be regarded as accessing flag);

sorting the plurality of integrated circuit devices in accordance with whether their enhanced reliability testing flag indicates they are in need of the enhanced reliability testing (Fig. 6b; col. 8, ln. 20-col. 9, ln. 18); and

performing the enhanced reliability testing for-the- each integrated circuit device of the plurality of integrated circuit devices requiring the enhanced reliability testing (Id., Fig. 6b, tester 4c).

Here, the stored information can be regarded as an "enhanced" or "further" reliability testing flag as Yabe teaches that defective chips no longer undergo testing

while non-defective chips may undergo *further* sorting and testing based on narrower parameters than the original chip tester (col. 8, ln. 37-col. 9, ln. 5). That is, the use of test parameters that have been modified based on previous test results or that have been modified based on desired sorting grades can be regarded as a form of "enhanced" reliability testing as the original test parameters have been "enhanced".

Yabe as set forth above thus teaches all that is claimed except for expressly teaching said flag stored in the integrated circuit device. Di Zenzo, however, teaches the storage of enhanced testing flags on the chip (col. 2, ln.45- col. 4, ln. 30 teaching use of register to store testing information and sorting of chips based on said information so that chips can be subjected to further, i.e., enhanced, testing). Moreover, Di Zenzo expressly teaches that this type of flag storage simplifies the manufacturing process and reduces manufacturing costs (col. 5, ln. 37-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Yabe as taught above.

### **Conclusion**

Any references not explicitly discussed above but made of record are considered relevant to the prosecution of the instant application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Joseph C Rodriguez** whose telephone number is **571-272-6942** (M-F, 9 am – 6 pm, EST).

The **Official** fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

The examiner's **UNOFFICIAL Personal fax number** is **571-273-6942**.

Further, information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.

Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PMR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see

<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>

Should you have questions on access to the Private PMR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (Toll Free).

Alternatively, inquiries of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding can also be directed to the **Receptionist** whose telephone number is **571-272-6584** or to the Supervisory Examiner, Patrick Mackey, **571-272-6916**.

Signed by Examiner Joseph Rodriguez

Jcr

\*\*\*

August 5, 2006

